

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/645,167	08/20/2003		Scott McCuan		7619	
42794	7590	10/06/2004		EXAMINER		
DENNIS V			PECHHOLD, ALEXANDRA K			
19900 BEACH BOULEVARD, SUITE C-2 HUNTINGTON BEACH, CA 92648			1	ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
		,		3671		

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/645,167	MCCUAN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alexandra K Pechhold	3671
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Sec. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) is/are pending in the application	rears on the cover sheet with the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE date of this communication, even if timely filed exprember 2004. Reptember 2004. Rection is non-final. Rece except for formal matters, profix parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	S) FROM sely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). , may reduce any
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>11-15</u> is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,6,7 and 10</u> is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>4,5, 8,9,16</u> is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 11)	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is objected	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	have been received. have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te

Application/Control Number: 10/645,167 Page 2

Art Unit: 3671

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1, line 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: it appears that "is" should be inserted before "disposed". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-3, 6, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman (US 5,143,478).

Regarding claim 1, Bowman discloses a device to inhibit entry of debris and other matter into a conduit comprising:

- an outer band, seen as keeper ring (18), an inner band, seen as base ring (11), wherein said inner band disposed interior to said outer band as Figs. 1 and 2 show, and a cover, disclosed in column 5, lines 19-21 and 30-32, wherein a perimeter edge of said cover is between said outer band and said inner band;
- said outer band having two separated ends, shown in Fig. 1 with the gap (27)
 therebetween, and said inner band having two separated ends seen as ends (12)
 and (13) in Fig. 1; and

an expansion clamp attached to one of said inner band and said outer band,
 seen as wrench grip (16) in Fig. 1.

Bowman fails to disclose that the cover is fastened, instead just merely noting its placement in column 5, lines 19-21 and 30-32, which is between the outer ring (18) and inner ring (11). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cover of Bowman to be fastened in its location, since it is well known in the art of manholes to secure covers by some fastening means to prevent their unintentional displacement or removal.

Regarding claim 2, a portion of said outer band having a portion of said outer band overlapping adjacent said two separated ends, seen as cover (28) in Fig. 1 which Is part of the outer band that overlaps the separated ends, and said expansion clamp is attached to said inner band, shown in Fig. 1.

Regarding claim 3, Fig. 1 of Bowman illustrates a plurality of screws at (14) and (14).

Regarding claim 6, a plurality of anchor bolts threadably engaged with said inner band is shown in Fig. 1, and said anchor bolts are movable through said inner band and said outer band since they constrict or expand the size of base ring (11) which in turn constricts or expands the size of the keeper ring (18).

Regarding claim 10, Bowman fails to disclose the inner band as being narrower than the outer band. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the thickness of ring (11) and ring (18) so

Art Unit: 3671

that ring (11) is narrower, since such a dimensional modification does not affect the structure and function of the adjustable manhole cover support of Bowman.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman (US 5,143,478) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sauriol et al (US 3,920,347). Bowman fails to disclose a handle, but Sauriol teaches a handle rings (60) on a cover. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cover of Shenk to include a handle as taught by Sauriol, since Sauriol's handle facilitates removal of the cover which provides greater accessibility.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 9/10/04, with respect to the rejection of claim 1 under Shenk et al (US 2,145,613) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, and considering the amendments to the claims a new ground of rejection is made in view of Bowman (US 5,143,478).

Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. Claims 11-15 are allowed.
- 7. Claims 4, 5, 8, 9, and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3671

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexandra Pechhold whose telephone number is (703) 305-0870. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs, from 8:00am to 5:30pm and alternating Fridays from 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas B. Will, can be reached on (703)308-3870. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

> Supervisor **∳** Patent Examiner **Group 3600**

AKP

9/23/04